

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 remain pending in this application wherein claims 1-4 are amended and claims 5 and 6 are canceled by this reply. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in at least Figs. 5-7 of the drawings and the associated text of the specification.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 5 is hereby canceled and accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Office Publication No. EP 0 306 989 to Fitzgerald (“Fitzgerald”) in further view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 2002-324083 to Takarada et al. (“Takarada”). Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fitzgerald in further view of Takarada and Japanese Patent Publication No. 05-225270 to Sawada (“Sawada”). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method for creating a two-dimensional drawing requiring, among other things, “a step of selecting and adding only necessary dimension line elements in the two-dimensional projection drawing from the selected dimension line elements in accordance with a selection at least one of a part form, an arrangement, a direction, an addition direction, and a part code.”

Fitzgerald discloses a computer aided drafting (CAD) method that uses a three dimensional model to generate dimensional views and drawings. In the method described in Fitzgerald, dogleg extension lines are used with dimension lines to provide dimensioning information for a view.¹ However, there is no disclosure in Fitzgerald to select a dimension line element as necessary and to display only necessary dimension line elements of the dimension lines retrieved for a shape code as required by claim 1. Further, Applicants submit that this deficiency in the teachings of Fitzgerald is not cured by the Takarada and Sawada references.

Takarada discloses a CAD system using a three dimensional model for displaying attribute information such as dimensions and dimension tolerances. The Office Action cites Takarada as disclosing “a processing device, a memory source, and an input device” and “a step of extracting a designated drawing frame from a drawing frame database that stores drawing frame data.”² Applicants submit, however, that Takarada does not teach or suggest selecting necessary dimension line elements from selected dimension line elements as required by claim 1.

Sawada discloses a CAD device which inputs a certain data exchange file of size lines whose size tolerances and size values are provided separately and

¹ Fitzgerald, Abstract.

² Office Action, page 4, ¶5.

that assembles the data into size lines having size values with size tolerances.³ The Office Action cites Sawada solely as disclosing “extracting remarks from a design reference data base and describing them at designated positions on the two- dimensional projection drawing.”⁴

Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Fitzgerald, Takarada, and Sawada, because the combination does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 identified above.

Claim 3 recites an automatic two-dimensional drawing creation system having a selecting and adding means that selects only necessary dimension line elements in the two-dimensional projection drawing from the selected dimension line elements in accordance with a selection of at least one of a part form, an arrangement, a direction, an addition dimension, and a part code. The selecting and adding means recited in claim 3 performs a function similar to the feature identified above as recited by claim 1. The Office Action rejects claim 3 using the same rationale used to reject claim 1.

Applicants submit that claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over Fitzgerald, Takarada, and Sawada for at least reasons similar to those given for claim 1 above. Further, dependent claims 2 and 4 are patentably distinguishable from Fitzgerald, Takarada, and Sawada at least by way of their dependencies

³ Sawada English Abstract.

⁴ Office Action, page 5, ¶6

from independent claims 1 and 3. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 1-4 for obviousness be withdrawn.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #038921.58288US).

Respectfully submitted,

November 14, 2008

/s/ Isaac R Clark

Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169

Isaac R. Clark
Registration No. 54,572

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:IRC
6614020v1#